

Appl. No. : 10/666,835
Filed : September 19, 2003

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Discussion of Statutory Double Patenting Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 2 as claiming the same invention in U.S. Patent No. 6,636,683. Applicant has hereby cancelled Claim 2 and amended Claim 2 to be dependent on Claim 3. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis of this rejection to the claims has been overcome.

Discussion of Obvious-Type Double Patenting Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3-13 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 3-8 of the '683 Patent. In response, Applicant has submitted herewith a terminal disclaimer. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis of this rejection to the claims has been overcome and all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance.

Summary

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 7/21/2005

By: 

Eric M. Nelson
Registration No. 43,829
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550